REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 5 and 11-30 are canceled.

The arguments and amendments presented herein include the arguments and amendments Applicants discussed with the Examiner during phone interview dated October 21, 2008. The Examiner requested Applicants to submit the discussed arguments and amendments for reconsideration, which Applicants present herein. Applicants submit that the arguments and amendments presented herein make the substance of the phone interview of record to comply with 37 CFR 1.133. If the Examiner believes that further information on the interview needs to be made of record to comply with the requirements, Applicants request the Examiner to identify such further information.

In this Amendment, Applicants have amended claims and cancelled non-method claims 11-30 from further consideration in this application. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner. Claims were amended and cancelled in this Amendment solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the pending claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by claims, as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims in one or more continuing applications.

1.   Claims 1-4 and 8-9 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4 and 8-9 as anticipated (35 U.S.C. §102(e)) by Moehrle (U.S. Patent No. 7,216,301). Applicants traverse.

Amended claim 1 recites a method, comprising: rendering a display of names of a first and second data sets in a search panel, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components; receiving selection of the displayed first data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected first data set in the search panel; receiving selection of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected first data set; rendering the selected data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name in a history panel, wherein the selected first data set name and selected at least one file component are displayed in a hierarchical tree arrangement; receiving selection of the displayed second data set name in the search panel; displaying names of the file components associated with the selected second data set in the search panel; receiving selection

of at least one of the displayed file component names associated with the selected second data set; and rendering the selected second data set name and the selected at least one selected file component name associated with the selected second data set in the history panel, wherein the selected first and second data set names and selected file components associated with the first and second data sets are displayed together in the hierarchical tree arrangement to display previously and currently selected data set names and component file names of the selected data sets.

Applicants amended the claims to recite that first and second data set names are selected to allow selection of their file components to display in the history panel. FIGs. 2-8 and the corresponding discussion on paras. 12-17 disclose how selection of different data sets displays their file components in the search view, and selected data set names, such as MAS.SOURCE.COBOL and MAS.SOURCE.PLI, cause display of their components, such as shown in panels 58, 104, and 112 in FIGs. 3-8. Selected data set names and components are displayed in work history view of FIGs. 3-8. The added requirements are disclosed in FIGs. 2-8 and paras. 12-17 of the Specification.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4A, element 102, FIG. 4B, elements 10b-10d, FIG. 4C, and col. 5, lines 6-9, of Moehrle as disclosing the claim requirement of rendering a display of at least one data set name, wherein each data set is associated with one or more file components. (Final Office Action, pgs. 2-4) Applicants traverse with respect to the amended claims.

The cited FIG. 4A, element 102 provides an initial view of an active path having a single active link. Moehrle defines an active path as a sequence of active links as items, where an active link provides direct access to a function corresponding level or menu item without the need to navigate using a GUI. (Moehrle, col. 2, lines 45-51). FIGs. 4B shows a user browsing the active path 100 of FIG. 4A, rolling over active link 1.2.3 causes the display of all siblings of the rolled over active link, 1.2.3.1, 1.2.3.2, 1.2.3.3…. Rolling over an active link displays the siblings and children of the active link. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 27-32)

Nowhere does the cited Moehrle disclose that upon selecting a first and second data set names in a search view and selecting file components of the first and second data set names in the search panel, the selected first and second data set names and selected file components are displayed in a separate history panel. There is no disclosure or mention in the cited Moehrle of a history panel displaying previously and currently selected data set names and selected

component file names of the selected data sets in a hierarchical tree arrangement. Instead, the cited Moehrle discusses showing all siblings of a selected active link. There is no disclosure or mention of the separate history panel as claimed. Instead, the cited Moehrle discuses predefined short-cuts to provide direct access to a given menu item. (Col. 2, lines 52-58)

Moreover, the cited Moehrle does not disclose that a history panel displays to together selected first and second data set names and the selected file components of the selected first and second data set names separately from the search panel in which the data set and file component names were selected. Instead, the cited Moehrle discusses displaying all siblings of a selected active link. Further, there is no disclosure of a history panel that displays previously and currently selected data set and file component names.

Yet further, the cited Moehrle discusses displaying hierarchical active links or menu items that are used to execute functions. (Moehrle, col. 5, lines 4-20). This does not disclose rendering the selected data set name and a selected file component name in a history panel in a hierarchical tree arrangement. Instead, the cited active links arranged in a hierarchical fashion comprise functions the user may select. The cited links do not comprise a data set name and selected file component name of the selected data set name.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that the claim 1 is patentable over the cited art because the cited Moehrle does not disclose all the claim requirements.

Claims 2-4 and 8-9 are patentable over the cited art because they depend from claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above. Moreover, the following dependent claims provide additional grounds of patentability over the cited art.

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and further requires that the first and second data set names are displayed as a parent at a higher hierarchical level to the file components associated with the displayed first and second data set names, wherein the file components are rendered as children in the history panel of the first or second data set with which they are associated.

Claim 2 is amended to clarify that the displaying is with respect to first and second data set names, as cited in base claim 1.

The Examiner cited FIG. 4B, 10a-102, 101 and col. 3, lines 22-23 of Moehrle with respect to these claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 3)

The cited FIG. 4B shows menu items that are siblings, where the menu items are active links. Rolling over an active link with a pointer results in the display of siblings and children of

the active link. (col. 5, lines 27-31) The active links are functions that may be executed.
Nowhere does the cited FIG. 4B disclose a history panel that displays a selected first and second
data set names as a parent to their associated file components, which is different from the search
panel displaying data set names and file component names which the user may select. Instead,
the cited FIG. 4B displays a hierarchical arrangement of active links that may be selected to
execute a function, not those selected data set file component names as claimed. The cited col. 3
references the detailed description.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claim 2 provides additional grounds of
patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 2 are not disclosed in
the cited Moehrle.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1 and further requires transmitting a request for file
component names of the selected data set name, wherein the displayed file component names
comprise file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for file
component names.

The Examiner cited col. 9, lines 16-20 as disclosing the additional requirements of these
claims. (Final Office Action, pg. 3) Applicants traverse.

The cited col. 9 mentions a data file representing the hierarchical structure of a multi-
level hierarchical website is either constructed or retrieved from the server. The data file
representing the information hierarchy of the location may be dynamically created from the
directory structure and the hypertext markup language (HTML) available on the server and client
files.

Although the cited col. 9 mentions retrieving a data file representing a hierarchical
structure of a web site, this does not disclose transmitting a request for file components of a
selected data set name, where the displayed file component names for the selected data set name
are the file component names returned in response to the transmitted request for the file
component names. Instead, the cited col. 9 discusses retrieving a data file representing a
hierarchical structure of a web site, not file component names associated with a selected data set
name.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that dependent claim 4 provides additional grounds of
patentability over the cited art because the additional requirements of claim 4 are not disclosed in
the cited Moehrle.

2.   Claims 6, 7, and 10 are Patentable Over the Cited Art

The Examiner rejected claims 6, 7, and 10 as obvious (35 U.S.C. §103) over Moehrle in view of Arkhipov (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2005/0114769) Applicants traverse.

These claims are patentable over the cited art because they depend from base claim 1, which is patentable over the cited art for the reasons discussed above.

Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicant submits that the pending claims 1-4 and 5-10 are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact him at (310) 553-7977 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: October 23, 2008   By: /David Victor/

                                                      David W. Victor
                                                      Registration No. 39,867

Please direct all correspondences to:

David W. Victor
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210
Beverly Hills, CA 90212
Tel: (310) 553-7977
Fax: 310-556-7984